

21st Century Community Learning Centers Program

21st CCLC Reviewer Scoring Report – Cohort 10



Applicant Name:	East Allen Family Resource Center (DBA LEARN Resource Center)
Proposal Ranking:	47
Average Score	96.25/ 125

Proposal Strengths:

- The proposal is solid in many areas. The applicant has the experience and capacity to operate programs for the identified schools.
- I think this was a good solid application for 21st CCLC funds, but it is an extremely competitive application. There seems to be a strong need in your community and your application did a good job presenting the academic data from each of the schools. Your evaluation plan was every strong and the activities seemed like they would have a good chance of attaining the desired results. I know I haven't given you a lot of strengths, and that isn't because there aren't strengths in your application, there most certainly are, but I want to give you feedback that will help you improve if you apply for 21st CCLC funding in the future or any other grants and I find that telling people about the little tweaks that make a difference to be more valuable than telling you that I appreciated your use of tables (which I completely did - they always are an appreciated way to organize information and help reviewers so much).
- LEARN has a history of serving students in the EACS area and seems to have an understanding of delivering quality programs. Literacy priority was evident throughout the application.

Proposal Weaknesses:

- The sustainability plan needs additional work and input from all stakeholders.
- There was a lack of detail in some sections and missing a few points here and there just adds up. Missing an MOU for your evaluator, not spelling out certain aspects of how you will advertise the program or recruit students to participate. Also, your PD plan could have been better thought out and I would have liked to have seen more detail in your summer schedule or at least more information on the activities that you planned to offer. In general, the application didn't seem to do an effective job at describing the ways in which the afterschool program would be different from the school day and how it was promoting literacy - yes there were several resources or programs that were literacy-focused like MyOn, and KidzLit, but there were also Math focused programs too - where was the extra emphasis on literacy? I am also a bit concerned by what seems like a heavy emphasis on computer-based programs for academic instruction - yes, children like computers, but out of school time is much more than staring at a screen.
- Overall, the application was confusing and incongruous at times. Certain aspects of the program were not evident in all areas of the application (drug prevention, behavior and physical activity goals). High need of students was not demonstrated, and community need information was not included. The program design and transportation plan did not

21st Century Community Learning Centers Program

21st CCLC Reviewer Scoring Report – Cohort 10



adequately address potential barriers including charging fees, subjective criteria for participation and not providing transportation. The program design had several vague portions that did not describe the activity planned. This application lacked a plan for evaluating and assessing staff. Minimum ratio required is 1:50 and staff can go up to 60 days without FA/CPR certification.

Top Areas Where Points Were Lost:

- Sustainability
- Partnerships
- MOU's
- Need for Project
- Program Design
- Safety and Transportation
- Budget
- Priority Points